

THE NEW YORK PRESS.

HISTORICAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALISTS UPON CURRENT TOPICS—COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.

The Greeley-Davis Imbroglio—True Statement of the Facts in this Curious Case.

From the Citizen.

Nothing can be more instructive than to watch the rapid growth and development of public opinion, in support of the position assumed by Mr. Greeley, when recording himself as one of the bondsmen for Jeff. Davis.

The first clamors raised against him were made by interested enemies, numerous and powerful—men in his own party either hostile to him from envy of his superior weight in the party councils, or by personal enemies with whose schemes of corruption, or for consolidated and self-perpetuating control, his pen has levied a relentless and successful war during the past quarter of a century.

And how contemptible in this contest has been the attitude of nearly all the organs assuming to represent Democratic opinion! They were either too cowardly or too personally venomous to assume the responsibility of endorsing any act with Mr. Greeley's signature appended.

At best they damned his generous deed with faintest praise, instead of giving due credit to his gallant protest in behalf of personal liberty, and acknowledging the noble motives of his self-sacrifice; while at worst—but we can hardly think with patience of their worst—they malignantly sneered at his appearance in Richmond, as "merely a trick of Philosopher Greeley for gratifying his insane passion for personal notoriety, and partly a trick for securing some circulation down South for his failing and dejected paper." Fugh! There is a moral grandeur in Greeley's attitude in this affair, which, growing in nobility and stature with each month that passes, will bring these pigmy detractors groveling to his feet before another year, and employ them all in hunting up certificates that they were among the first and loudest to applaud his act.

That thousands upon thousands of those who took part in the first obligations of Mr. Greeley were actuated by worthy but misguided motives, we do not merely admit, but can prove. They must be pardoned, for, blinded with passion, "they knew not what they did." They really meant to express horror of the late Rebellion and a sense of regret that it was found or thought to be impossible to bring the chief of that great conspiracy to justice—in which they have our sympathy. But they did not mean, we both hope and believe, to express a desire that the crowning provision of our fundamental law, which guarantees that every prisoner accused of any offense shall have either a trial by his peers within some reasonable time, or be entitled to his discharge from close arrest, either totally or on bail, should be abrogated. They did not mean that they wished to perpetuate arbitrary imprisonment in time of peace, without trial or conviction—thus rendering our Government a despotism not less absolute than that of France in her days of lettres de cachet, and before the destruction of the Bastille; and yet, now that sober judgment has come to replace the dictates of passion, they now realize—believe that nine-tenths of them do now realize—that this very thing must have been the result of any decision holding Davis in permanent confinement, while refusing the appeals of his counsel for trial under due process and the forms of law. It was against this establishment of an absolute tyranny on American soil—against the sanction of a precedent, placing the liberty and rights of every citizen through all future time at the mercy of an arbitrary Government, that Mr. Greeley's appearance at Richmond was an emphatic protest against.

It was not helping Jefferson Davis to escape trial, but demanding either that he should be tried or discharged on bail, as prescribed by the Constitution. He was contending for the civil rights of all Americans, in the North as well as in the South; and by maintaining this principle in the most extreme and odious case that could be presented, he gave to his protest against arbitrary rule the most emphatic and powerful illustration of which any example could be found.

That he sought as a volunteer the unenviable notoriety which must be the first immediate result of such a position, is not only untrue, but the violent reverse of truth. We know it was his prayer—not speaking irreverently—that if possible this oak might pass away from him; and we know that it was only when he found, on unquestionable authority, that without some action on his part, the dangerous and disgraceful precedent of permanently confining a prisoner without trial must be established, that he finally consented under a sense of duty—with reluctance, but without fear—to sacrifice himself, as did Curtius of old, by leaping into the yawning and ever-widening chasm which could not otherwise be closed. In taking the leap he well foresaw—none better—the powerful weapons of popular passion and prejudice which he was thus temporarily placing in the hands of his enemies.

He heard in advance their yells of revenge and exultation, as they watched their most dreaded and detested foe descend into the chasm. But it was his noble courage, also, not to be turned from his task of immediate sacrifice by any personal fear; and it was his noble faith in the final justice of the people, which made him see not less clearly the laurel crowns, and hear not less distinctly the peans welcoming a moral victor, which have already commenced to hail his rapid resurrection and ascent from the gulf of a wrongly forfeited popularity. Had President Lincoln lived, we believe that Jefferson Davis would have either been tried or totally discharged within six months from the day of his capture; and that Mr. Lincoln regretted the capture has already been made part of history. By his famous anecdote of the "White Elephant," when first informed of the arrest made by Major-General J. H. Wilson.

It was felt by every one in authority—we believe by Chief Justice Chase as well as others—that the continued imprisonment of Davis without trial was a most lamentable blot upon our national success. But these are days of weak men and strong passions; and the question was, who could be found bold enough and strong enough to "bell the cat"—to face the first missile certain to be evoked by an act so much at variance with the clamors of the extreme radical party? If all the bondsmen had been of the Democratic faith, the discharge on bail would certainly have been made by all radical orators and organs a cry against President Johnson, and the most serious feature in the labors of the late Impending Committee. It would have been denounced as an act of flagrant and odious treason, and would have assigned to political death every official who had taken hand, act, or part in the un-

holy thing; in other words, it certainly could not have been done without the powerful countenance of some such pillars of "accustomed loyalty" as Horace Greeley and Gerrit Smith; and it must forever remain a monument of honor to the generous impulses and wise courage of the two gentlemen, that their sense of justice could not be bent aside by the infuriate demands of party rancor, and that their devotion to humanity and the people's rights made them willing, if need were, to accept estrangement from all their former allies, rather than hesitate to avow and maintain their convictions. It was for these reasons, and because Davis could not otherwise have been bailed, and because his further confinement without trial tried as upon our laws, and was a disgrace to the country, that Mr. Greeley led the way, and that Gerrit Smith followed him, in placing two eminent Republican names on the document giving bail for his appearance whenever called upon to stand trial.

As to the charge that Horace Greeley did this thing from "personal sympathy," or under any other impulse than a strong sense of duty, it must suffice to say that he never spoke to Davis in his life until briefly introduced to him by Charles O'Connor in the court-room at Richmond, when their conversation did not probably cover a space of two minutes; and once again at an accidental meeting in the parlor of Mrs. Davis, who had expressed a wish to see Mr. Greeley and thank him for his humane response to her appeal on a former occasion, and for his powerful assistance in this final act. Greeley and Davis never exchanged one word or line together in regard to politics or any public questions; and yet the former has been unscrupulously represented, with view to his injury, as in "constant contact" with the great Rebel; and had elaborate reports of friendly visitings, and junketings, and political caucuses between the two at the New York Hotel, whereas in fact they never saw each other while Davis was passing through New York—never, indeed, met anywhere except on the two occasions we have named, and then their conversation was simply of the character usual between gentlemen on such formal occasions. It was also charged—and this certainly, if true, would have been a grave offense, as an attempted tampering with the independence of the bench—that Mr. Greeley used his personal and political influence with Judge Underwood to secure an admittance of Mr. Davis to bail; while here again the fact is that Greeley never saw the Judge while in Richmond except in the court-room, and never exchanged with him one word in regard to the trial, except a formal request to have his bail accepted on property in the State of New York without some legal ceremony of having the bail vouched for by persons residing in the Richmond District. So much for some of the more egregious fallacies put forth by those who have sought to make the noble act of Mr. Greeley a basis of attack for their personal spite.

Our Jury System.

From the Tribune.

Trial by jury is one of the peculiar institutions of which the Anglo-Saxon race is justly proud and tenacious. Badly as it works in many cases, no one can doubt that its entire abolition would throw a dangerous amount of power into the hands of judges, corrupting the best of them, as uncontrolled power always does corrupt. Like all other institutions by which free people seek to preserve their liberties, it is cumbersome and troublesome compared with the peremptory methods of despotic governments; and its burdens are sometimes felt so strongly by the community as to make it in a certain sense unpopular.

Every business man knows how unwelcome to him is the dirty scrap of paper in which the Sheriff invites him to attend the next Circuit Court. It destroys his peace of mind for a week before the Court opens. If he has a lawyer in his employment, or among his friends, he insists that the latter shall serve his name of the jury-list. He becomes so nervous that he is sure he must be ill, and considers himself injured if his doctor will not give him a certificate showing him to be on the high road to the grave. If, however, all devices fail to excuse his presence at the opening of the Court, and he does not choose to risk the fine, he sits impatiently with his companions in affliction until the Judge calls for excuses. Then follows a scene which is the exact counterpart of Nasby's caucus at the Cleveland Convention, where, it may be remembered, upon the Chairman calling for "resolutions," every delegate arose, and putting his hand into his breast pocket, said he had "dotted down a few ideas which he would submit to the caucus." Just so, when the Judge inquires whether any juror has an excuse to offer, every man in the room seems to rise and make his way to the bench, with an extreme anxiety to escape from his unwelcome duty visible upon his countenance. The unanimity with which excuses are offered, of course makes the Judge reluctant to accept any; and thus it not seldom happens that jurors feel themselves to be unfairly treated—their excuses, which they know to be truthful and just, being rejected simply because the Judge has become disgusted with the shuffling and prevarication of those who preceded them on the line.

The unwillingness of respectable men to serve on juries is a matter of which we obtain some notion, because they hear it said that the jury panels are made up from the poll-lists, and in some cases they refuse their names to the City Directory for the same reason. Some take refuge in the uniformed militia; or, in the days of volunteer fire departments, preferred to lose their rest of nights and their peace by day at the tintinnulation of the bell, rather than serve their country in the tranquil jury-box.

The result is, and has been for an indefinite period in the past, that business in the Courts is often materially delayed by the lack of jurors. At the commencement of the present term of Court, no business could be done on the first day for want of the same to twelve. This total stoppage of business is not an infrequent occurrence; while a delay of one or two hours on the same account is such a common occurrence that the reporters never deem it worthy of mention. The inconvenience caused by this constant interruption of business is very great, especially to suitors, and has a large share in producing those delays of the law of which laymen so much complain.

The evils of the present system are obvious enough; but the remedies are not quite so clear. Very simple expedients will suffice to get juries in abundance, such as they are; and would suffice to insure a perennial supply. But quality as well as quantity must be considered; and the class of men who would be tempted by the pay alone, at any conceivable rate, would be undesirable jurors. Some means should be found of making the service tolerable to men engaged in regular pursuits, and whom no pecuniary compensation would tempt to become professional jurors.

Proper compensation is certainly one im-

portant, and indeed essential, step towards reform. Every jurymen in this city should receive at least two dollars a day, promptly paid. Even a wealthy man likes to receive enough to pay for his lunch on such occasions; and to the majority of jurors this few would sensibly diminish their loss, and consequently their sense of hardship. But, after all, it would not amount to half the daily earnings of a decent mechanic, and would be ridiculous, considered as an inducement, to a prosperous tradesman.

The principal reason, as far as we can judge, why business men object to jury duty is that it takes them away from business for a long time at once, upon short notice, and with an entire disregard of their convenience, or even of their necessities. In short, the system is a cast-iron one, and cannot be accommodated to the wants of individual men. Thus, a friend of ours commenced a term of service at the Circuit Court, expecting to go through with it; but suddenly finding himself defrauded to a large amount by parties who had run off westward, he was obliged to leave instantly in pursuit, and did not return until the Court had adjourned. Shortly afterwards, he was called upon to pay a fine of \$25 for every day of his absence. Naturally he felt that this was practically unjust, however difficult it might have been to frame a rule to meet this case. So one class of men can easily spare a couple of weeks out of January, who could not afford to lose two hours in May; while another class could spare the time in May better than in any other month; and yet another class could well afford to lose one day in each of six consecutive months, who would be almost ruined by leaving their business for a fortnight consecutively, at any season of the year.

Why should not the law be so framed and administered as to accommodate all these classes? Let us suppose, for example, that a jurymen is required to serve five days in a year, which is quite as much as should be required, and that he can arrange these to suit himself on receiving a summons. Juror No. 1 concludes to serve his five days at once. No. 2 has leisure time in February, and prefers to clear himself for two years by serving ten days in that month. No. 3 prefers to serve in instalments, and is set down for the first Monday of each month, from January to May. No. 4 is set down at his request for the third Monday of the same months. No. 5 takes the second Thursdays of October to March. Each would receive a certificate, setting forth the time appointed for his services, and this would be checked from day to day by the clerk until the whole period was filled up, when the certificate would be completed by a formal discharge of the juror for one, two, or three years, as the case might be. It would not be advisable to allow a juror to exempt himself for a longer period than three years.

Of course, it would not be possible to meet precisely all the preferences of each jurymen. An excessive number might choose to serve in a particular month, or on particular days of the week. As soon as a full supply was secured for one day, the remaining jurymen must, of course, select some other day. By allowing for all possible drawbacks, we think the plan we have suggested would work beneficially. It would increase the labors of some officers of the courts; but that is a matter easily provided for. The public convenience, and the improvement of the administration of justice, are the chief things to be considered.

The convenience of jurymen being thus consulted, and their pay increased, the fines imposed for non-attendance should be strictly enforced; and the officer empowered to collect them should be held to a full accountability for such collections. All the cases connected with juries should be put in charge of a single officer, and the term fees now collected by the sheriff (by what authority no one knows) should go to the officer in charge, to be paid to the court.

We do not pretend to have covered all the details of this subject, as they would require more time and space than we can bestow upon them; but we believe that a general plan is here marked out, by which a great and highly desirable reform may be accomplished.

General Sheridan—The Efforts for his Removal.

From the Times.

There is nothing surprising in the statement from Washington that the deposition of Governor Wells has led to renewed efforts for the removal of General Sheridan. The friends of the Rebel Monroe, and the friends of the hybrid radical Wells, have for some time worked in unison upon this point. They have had their respective revenges to gratify, and their respective interests to serve, and with all their differences they have concurred in the desire to mortify and punish the cause of their discomfiture. The deputation of Wells has brought things to a crisis, and a grand combined struggle to put down Sheridan is the result.

The effort is made on the ground that Sheridan, by these acts of official rigor, had exceeded his powers. The opinion of the Attorney-General is rallied upon the fact that the Military Government acts do not invest the commanders with the power of removal. The President, it is insisted, not only may reverse the action of the General, and restore the aggrieved individual, but must do so in vindication of the law and his own superior authority. It is confidently said that this will be done, and as a further mark of Executive disapproval, that Sheridan himself will be transferred to another sphere of duty.

These and other considerations have no foundation except in the wishes of the party who propound them. We are satisfied that any reversal of Sheridan's proceedings would operate disastrously upon Union interests at the South, and that any rebuke or punishment of Sheridan for steps taken in the performance of his duty would be a very serious blunder on the part of the Administration.

It must be remembered that, apart from all considerations of legal right, the proceedings of Sheridan have in every instance commended themselves to the country as just, and in the main prudent. The first of the series of removals—that involving Judge Abell, Attorney-General Herron, and Mayor Monroe—was a righteous sentence of the murderer's right of last July. Their several degrees of responsibility cannot be more tersely stated than in the language of the General, explanatory of his order: "Mayor Monroe controlled the element engaged in this riot, and when backed by an Attorney-General who would not prosecute the guilty, and a Judge who advised the Grand Jury to find the innocent guilty and let the murderers go free, felt secure in engaging his police force in the riot and massacre." The technicalities of legal construction are as nothing against the substantial justice embodied in this measure; and no proceeding could be more clamorously demanded by the South or the President than any interference of the latter, looking to the restoration to office and honor of these men.

Again, with regard to the Levee Commissioners, what is the truth? Rebel Commissioners were in office, with a large fund at their disposal; Wells, in contravention of law, put corrupt nominees of his own in their places, with the avowed purpose of using the

funds for his personal and partisan advantage; Sheridan swept both Boards out of the way, and appointed another, in whose capacity and integrity Louisianians of all parties have confidence. Is it proper that the President shall step in to restore and strengthen the corrupt creatures whom Wells appointed for his own base ends? Is it expedient—would it be even decent—to set aside the good men whom Sheridan selected to make room for the bad men whom Wells had no right in law or equity to appoint? Mischiefs have already been wrought by interference in this case. The order of the Secretary of War, staying the proceedings of Sheridan's Board, is for the time a triumph for Wells' nominees, and the vitally important work of providing for the repair of levees and the relief of those who have suffered from inundations in Louisiana is paralyzed in interest of a notoriously untrustworthy faction.

The merits of Wells' removal are substantially the same. We have expressed the opinion that the manner of Sheridan's action in deposing Wells was more passionate and less dignified than we should have desired it to be. But of the one essential fact, that Wells was a treacherous, unworthy functionary, and that public interests will be benefited by his deposition, we have no doubt. Our only doubts relate to the manner of removal, not to the removal itself. Sheridan may have erred in the display of feeling under the provocation of Mr. Stanton's despatch, but the country will repose confidence in his estimate of Wells as a corrupt, tricky, and dishonest official, and a hindrance to reconstruction. Can the President afford to take such a man under his protection? Can he wisely, or even safely block up Sheridan's path, and undo what he has declared to be necessary, for the sake of Wells or any combination he may form?

We are persuaded that in these and all similar cases wide latitude must be left to the judgment of the Commanding General. The law invests him with almost unlimited authority, and in the nature of things he must be left to act very much upon the promptings of his own mind. He alone can determine the weight and tendency of the circumstances immediately around him, of which persons at a distance can form but a very imperfect estimate. And he is justified in expecting cordial and unwavering support from his superiors at Washington, especially when his course is susceptible of the clear and strong vindication which may be offered in behalf of all that Sheridan has done.

Whatever, then, be the decision of the Attorney-General respecting the general principle which is understood to be under his consideration, we trust that the President will sustain, in their entirety, the proceedings of Sheridan in the cases which are the immediate source of the discussion. There would be no impropriety, perhaps, in laying down a rule for the future guidance of the military commanders, though even this rule should not be adhered to too rigidly. But so far as the past is concerned, the obvious duty of the Executive is to ratify and uphold the action of Sheridan in respect of these removals.

Nominations for Presidency—Causes and Conventions Versus the Popular Will.

From the Herald.

We are on the eve of a great change in that important part of our political machinery, the nomination of men for the Presidency. Candidates who are merely the results of party bargains—who owe their prominence to the greater or less strength of this or that clique in some set assemblage of huckstering politicians—who are the accidents of a political condition, and represent only the compromises and cheats of party strife—such men can no longer be accepted by the country as rallying points for the expression of the popular purpose on great questions, or as the deliberate selection of the national will for the highest office in the gift of the people.

Washington was nominated for first President by the acclamation of the country—the spontaneous expression of every part of the people; and that was a case in which there could be no doubt who should be advanced to the first political dignity. But in subsequent elections, as no man was so definitely the representative of the national ideas—as differences on points of policy began to originate parties, the parties were put to choosing from their leaders the best type of themselves as able defenders of their principles. Causes of Congressmen were the first machinery for thus settling a party choice; and these causes acted with comparative honesty; for the men they put in nomination—all our early Presidents—were strictly typical of the great divisions of national thought, and were also men of high character—men who had achieved distinction for ability and worth.

But from the caucuses this work of organizing the people for elections fell into the hands of conventions as they exist at the present time. In these bodies originated the corruption of the country that now appals the people. Demoralization, beginning there, spread into all parts of our political system, until honor and honesty are no longer regarded as having any association with politics, and votes and offices are bought as openly and unblushingly, with as little sense of shame in the transaction, as though they were fish in the market. Conventions began by cheating the people they were chosen to act for—putting up second and third-rate men, with whom they could make terms, rather than great leaders, who would not stoop to tread the devious ways of corruption. Thus some of the great men of our history have been shut out of the Presidency, and that high place has been filled by other, absolutely unworthy such honor. How large a share this fact has had in causing our present troubles, every man who will think can see for himself. Finding how complete was their party control, these conventions run riot with their trading, and this degraded the personnel of the conventions. They are now made up of men to whom the places are accorded as so much property. Every vote is sold, if not for money, for office, and no politician dare so insult common sense as to pretend that these bodies represent any respectable portion of the people.

Will the people, then, any longer consent to be disgraced by the existence of these self-constituted bodies of political buyers and sellers? Evidently not. Conventions are repudiated by the national intelligence. Such organization of the people, good enough in its origin, is no longer necessary. Through the press, the telegraph, and the railroad, communication is now so rapid and constant, the transmission of ideas is so easy, that the people can come to an understanding without

Old Rye Whiskies. THE LARGEST AND BEST STOCK OF FINE OLD RYE WHISKIES IN THE LAND IS NOW POSSESSED BY HENRY S. HANNIS & CO., Nos. 218 and 220 SOUTH FRONT STREET, WHO OFFER THE SAME TO THE TRADE, IN LOTS, OR VERY ADVANTAGEOUS TERMS. Their Stock of Rye Whiskies, IN BOND, comprises all the favorite brands extant, and runs through the various months of 1865, '66, and of this year, up to present date. Liberal contracts made for lots to arrive at Pennsylvania Railroad Depot, Kricsson Line Wharf, or at Bonded Warehouses, as parties may select.

Carpetings, Canton Mattings, Oil Cloths. Great Variety, Lowest Cash Prices. REEVE L. KNIGHT & SON, No. 507 CHESTNUT STREET, (Below the Girard House).

REMOVED. OUR BEDDING STORE IS REMOVED FROM THE OLD STAND TO No. 11 South NINTH Street. H. L. KNIGHT & SON.

\$2,500,000,000 Debt to Pay, and the Eight-Hour Movement. From the World.

It is worth the while of the managers of the eight-hour movement, and those who support it, to consider what has befallen their Chicago friends who in like manner sought to interfere with the free exchange of services between man and man.

The eight-hour strike has ended in Chicago. For the whole month of May it was kept up, at an expense to the workmen who have been "on strike" of not less than one hundred thousand dollars—a sum sufficient, if there were three thousand workmen "on strike," to have established and stocked half-a-dozen co-operative stores and manufactories which would now be paying a profit to the contributors. This would have been the most effective protection to the workmen who deemed themselves aggrieved, and the most useful as well as profitable experience they could have undergone.

As employers, they would have seen the other side of the questions, "What should wages be?" "How many hours should workmen labor?" But the Chicago workmen have lost their strike and their money too; few of the employing shops but have obtained all the men they want, and the railroad-shop workmen are now sustaining the strike alone against a combination of interests which extends wherever iron tracks are laid, from Arostook to Texas, and from Savannah to many "miles beyond Omaha."

Indeed, the interests which are combined against the success of the eight-hour movement are incalculable in amount, for they include the entire community, except the eight-hour demagogues and the misguided men who follow their dictation. We shall be told that several States have passed eight-hour laws, and that in political conventions parties compete for the workingman's favor, by pledging their efforts for such legislation. We are very well aware that the pusillanimity of hand-mouth politicians in both the great political parties has given to this eight-hour movement a seeming start and promise of success. But we prefer to justify the favor with which the workmen of this country have always regarded the Democratic party and followed its leaders, by telling them the plain truth about the business, and by exposing to them the groundlessness of hopes which interested demagogues have nursed and taught them to cherish.

Again and again we repeat that the eight-hour movement could at no time have been a wise or successful movement. But it was an absurd and impossible movement at the end of a war which left upon us a national debt of two and a half billions, State, county, and city debts amounting to two and a half billions more, and war claims of perhaps two and a half billions more. For this debt signifies interminable taxes, and such taxes signify an endless mortgage upon the capital of the rich and the industry of the poor—a ceaseless discount and drain upon the energies of all. When a nation which was free of debt as we were, incurs a debt as we have, then it follows inevitably that every man and woman who joins in paying the debt gives more labor for the same return, or the same labor for a less return. Suppose a workman were, in a fit of passion, to smash his tools and burn his wife's clothes, could he keep on and thrive as well, and work as little and receive as much, after that piece of folly as before? Would not the tools have to be repaired or replaced, and his wife re clothed, and would not these be new expenditures to be defrayed out of his work? The expenditures of war must in like manner be defrayed, and the workman of no degree can escape his share of the burden. The houses and the barns which are the farmer's tools; the cities which were stored with our wealth; the gunpowder which was blown into air; the millions of balls which are sown and rusting in the Southern fields; the diminished increase of our crops because of the farmers who were called away from productive to unproductive labor; the costly transportation hither and thither, and the costlier feeding and clothing and arming of workers transformed to idlers, and of parents turned into slayers; all these losses that were wasted for four years; and all these that were worse than wasted by the bullet and the sabre; these we have got to pay for, and no man can help paying for them, nor any class hope to shift the burden upon any other class, or all others.

But demagogues tell workmen that they can get the same wages for eight hours' labor as formerly for ten. We tell the workman that he cannot get the same wages for eleven

hours' labor as formerly for ten. Ten hours' labor per day, no matter of what sort, will not return the same wages to any laborer. The lawyer, the minister, the banker, the journalist, the merchant, the manager, the foreman, the mechanic, the farmer, the laborer, all get less pay for the same work—get more than one-tenth less. Wages may go up or down, as stocks may, or gold, or cotton, or wheat, but the return for labor, year in and year out, will have less purchasing power, less comfort-getting, happiness-obtaining, power than formerly; less by more than one-tenth, in all departments of human industry, highest to the lowest. That is what it means to have a debt of billions. Further evils of like sort we are suffering because that our national industry is paralyzed, and because that our irredeemable and fluctuating currency debauches credit and commerce; but these are evils which in time can and will be remedied by the opponents of the men now in power and responsible for their enormity. The gigantic debt which they have created is not in the power of any party or administration to remove. The national debt alone makes the success of the eight-hour movement impossible.

It may be asked why the eight-hour movement interferes with the free exchange of services between man and man. In this manner—either an eight-hour law would establish less work for the same wages, or more wages for the same work among a considerable number of employes; or would establish less work for the same wages among the few employees of Government; or would reduce wages and work both in the proportion of ten to eight; or would be a dead letter on the statute-book, and have no result at all. Now in determining how much work for how much wages, the debate should be perfectly free between him who has wages to exchange for work and him who has work to exchange for wages. These two alone are concerned. The interference of outsiders is an impertinence—of Government, is an oppression. The workman is master of the quantity and the quality of the labor he will sell. The employer is master of what labor he will buy, what wages he will pay. They often differ, but must come together at last, and that no injustice may be done to either, debate must be utterly free. Then the exchange of service will be free.

But just as the manufacturing capitalists have made use of Government machinery and Government power to disturb this free debate, and to cripple this free exchange in their own selfish interest, so the demagogues who want the votes of workmen are telling them that they too can step in and make use of the enormous power of Government to disturb this free debate, and constrain to their own advantage what should be an unconstrained and free exchange.

Such are the objections to any Government interference of whatever sort. Descending to detail, no advocate of the eight-hour law seeks to put a dead letter on the statute-book, or seeks to reduce wages and work both in the proportion of 10 to 8. If the passage of such a law were to have these results only, he would feel that he had labored in vain. Were its passage to result in giving the same wages for less work to a few employes of Government only, his failure would be hardly less complete. In order to profit, unduly and unfairly, a few favored fellow-workmen by paying them more than current rates he would have imposed a considerable tax upon all the rest of their fellow-citizens who, in great proportion, are workmen. The only remaining effect of an eight-hour law would be to establish less work for the same wages, or more wages for the same work, among a slightly larger number of workmen. "Slightly larger," for we have repeatedly shown how few and innumerable the classes are to whom an eight-hour rule could or would apply, though written on every statute-book in Christendom—not possibly to farmers or farm-laborers, not possibly to mechanics who own their tools and work by the piece, not possibly to the workmen engaged directly in transportation by railroad on land, or by steam or sail on sea; and so on till you come to the small and few classes to whom an eight-hour law could and would apply if one were enacted and enforced. And now we say that to these classes utterly impossible has our huge national debt made it for the same work to get the same wages. Utterly futile and hopeless, therefore, is any movement led by demagogues, pandered to by politicians, for giving by law the same wages for less work.